



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/815,954	03/23/2001	Irving A. Gibbs	00-PCS-157	6469

7590

11/18/2004

Martin J. Moran
Cutler-Hammer Products
170 Industry Drive
RIDC Park, West
Pittsburgh, PA 15275

EXAMINER

JUNG, DAVID YIUK

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2134

DATE MAILED: 11/18/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/815,954

Applicant(s)

GIBBS ET AL.

Examiner

David Y Jung

Art Unit

2134

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 30 August 2001.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-19 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-19 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 23 March 2001 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 3/23/2001.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

CLAIMS PRESENTED

Claims 1-19 are presented.

CLAIM REJECTIONS

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Myers (A Decentralized Model For Information Control, 1997) and Van Meter (VISA: Netstation's virtual Internet SCSI adapter, 1998)

Regarding claim 1, Van Meter teaches "1. A method of enabling at least one ... block having an identifier for a controller having a unique identification, said method comprising the steps of: encoding an enable code for the functional block of said controller based upon the unique identification of said controller and the identifier of said ... block (page 72, i.e. derived virtual device in which the set of types of access is set as policy by owner, also Figure 1);

decoding the enable code for the ... block of said controller to obtain a decoded identification and a decoded identifier ; and enabling the ... block of said controller when

Art Unit: 2134

said decoded identification is equal to said unique identification and said decoded identifier is equal to the identifier of said ... block (page 72, i.e. derived virtual device in which the set of types of access is set as policy by owner, also Figure 1).

These passages of Van Meter do not teach "functional" in the sense of the claim.

Myers teaches such "functional" nature (page 131, the customer requests which are requests for functions such as transactions) for the motivation of decentralizing information control (page 131).

Hence, it would have been obvious to those of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the claimed invention to combine Van Meter and Myers for the motivation noted in the previous paragraphs so as to teach the claimed invention.

Claims 2-19 depend from claim 1.

Regarding claims 2, 3, 5, 6, 7, 8, 15, 17, 18, 19, these claims recite limitations regarding typical purchasing/selling situations. Purchasing and selling are well known in the art of e-commerce for the motivation of permitting transactions. Myers gives an example of a banking e-commerce at its page 131.

Regarding claims 4, 9-14, 16, these claims recite limitations regarding typical software and hardware used in such multi level security systems. Such software and hardware are well known in the art for the motivation of actuating e-commerce. Myers gives a citation to a previous multi-level security system (at page 142, citing McIlroy and Reeds).

Conclusion

Art Unit: 2134

The art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. The art disclosed general background.

Points of Contact

Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Washington, D.C. 20231

or faxed to:

(703) 746-7239, (for formal communications intended for entry)

Or:

(703) 746-5606 (for informal or draft communications, please label "PROPOSED" or "DRAFT")

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park II, 2121 Crystal Drive, Arlington, VA., Sixth Floor (Receptionist).

Art Unit: 2134

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to David Jung whose telephone number is (571) 272-3836 or Greg Morse whose telephone number is (571) 272-3838.

David Jung

Patent Examiner

11/15/04

A handwritten signature in black ink, consisting of a large, stylized 'D' followed by a series of loops and a final checkmark-like stroke.